

*City of San José*  
***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

**Summary of Task Force Meeting**  
**February 13, 2006**  
**200 E. Santa Clara Street, Rooms W118-120**

**Task Force Members Present**

Co-chair councilmember Forrest Williams, co-chair councilmember Nancy Pyle, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Eric Carruthers, Pat Dando, Russ Danielson, Gladwyn D'Souza, Craige Edgerton, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Schott, Jr., Steve Speno, and Neil Struthers.

**Task Force Members Absent**

Helen Chapman.

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present**

Dawn Cameron (County Roads), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Jane Mark (County Parks), David Bischoff (City of Morgan Hill), Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Melissa Hippard (Sierra Club), Libby Lucas (California Native Plant Society), Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Beverly Bryant (HBANC), Tim Steele (Sobrato Development Corporation), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

**City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present**

Councilmember Linda J. LeZotte (Council District 1), Lee Wilcox (Council District 10), John Mills (Council District 6), Rachel Gibson (Supervisor Don Gage's Office), Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Gerry De Guzman (Public Works), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Hans Larsen (DOT), Manuel Pineda (DOT), and Paul Ma (DOT).

## **Consultants Present**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Jodi Starbird (David Powers and Associates), and Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers).

## **Community Members Present**

Mayor Dennis Kennedy, Tom Armstrong, Shiloh Ballard, Pete Benson, Mike Biggar, Michael Bini, Roger Costa, Sean Cottle, Richard DeSmet, Robert Eltgroth, Pete Furman, Larry Glick, Virginia Holtz, Dennis Martin, Ken Mikami, Michael Mulcahy, Gorgene Petri, George Reilly, Peter Rothchild, Art Sanchez, Annie Saso, Martin Seebach, Pauline Seebach, Pete Silva, Jennifer Simmons, Al Victors, Don Weden, Kim Weden, and Jan Warne.

### **1. Welcome**

The meeting convened at 5:33 p.m. with co-chair councilmember Forrest Williams welcoming everyone to the 39<sup>th</sup> Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) task force meeting. Councilmember Williams introduced council member Nancy Pyle as the new CVSP co-chair.

### **2. Acceptance of January 9, 2006 Task Force Meeting Summary**

Councilmember Williams called for a motion to accept the January 9, 2006 task force meeting summary.

The task force provided the following comment:

- In regards to the comment on page 3, “Need to keep funds in Coyote Valley to achieve our goals and objectives,” it may not be possible to place this type of restriction on the Open Space Authority funds. The OSA is an independent agency.

The January 9, 2006 task force meeting summary will include the aforementioned comment. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Current Calendar**

Laurel Prevetti, deputy director of the Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement Department, provided an update of the CVSP calendar. There will be biweekly task force meetings. Traffic issues will be discussed at the February task force meetings.

There will be monthly progress reports to the City Council. At the fourth City Council progress report on January 31, 2006, Council had comments regarding the Caltrain connection to Coyote Valley and finding a replacement for Terry Watt on the task force. Staff will present replacement recommendations for Council consideration at the fifth Council progress report (Study Session) on March 3, 2006.

The next community meeting will take place on Thursday, February 23, 2006 at the Coyote Creek Golf Club from 6:30-8:30 p.m. The draft specific plan is still in preparation.

The task force provided the following questions and comments:

- According to the agenda, is there supposed to be a handout of the CVSP calendar? *No, staff only presented a verbal report update, and a revised work program will be available soon.*
- What will be discussed at the February community meeting and the March Council progress report? *The draft CVSP traffic policy options will be discussed at the February community meeting. The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt Strategy will be discussed at the March Council progress report.*
- What is the status of the fiscal analysis and financing strategy? *The fiscal analysis and financing strategy will be discussed at the task force meeting in late March.*
- Discussion of the draft CVSP affordable housing strategy has been deferred for the second time. Recommended that this item be discussed at the March 13, 2006 task force meeting. *Staff indicated that this item is planned for the March 13<sup>th</sup> Task Force agenda.*

#### **4. Discussion of Draft Affordable Housing Strategy for Coyote Valley**

This item has been deferred to the task force meeting on March 13, 2006.

#### **5. Discussion of Potential Traffic Policy Approaches for Coyote Valley**

Darryl Boyd, with the PBCE Department, reviewed the potential traffic policy approaches for Coyote Valley. The purpose of this discussion was to obtain input on the approaches for traffic Level of Service (LOS) in Coyote Valley. Darryl provided an overview of regional transportation planning, the Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes as it relates to Coyote Valley transportation, the San Jose 2020 General Plan transportation policies, the Council's transportation policy, existing area development policies, the proposed new circulation system/elements for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan, the CVSP traffic policy options, and the next steps for CVSP traffic policy.

The task force provided the following questions and comments:

- Why are traffic issues being presented when the traffic analysis has not been completed?  
*The purpose of this discussion is to obtain input on the traffic policy options for Coyote Valley with the understanding that there is not any data yet. This is the first of many discussions on transportation planning. Traffic will be an important part of the analysis in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the CVSP.*
- Explain “Level of Service”, and why LOS standards are defined as a goal rather than as an acceptable standard, but not necessarily the preferred, LOS? The CVSP goal is to internalize as many vehicle trips as possible within the project area. A higher intersection LOS may be acceptable in order to accomplish other CVSP goals.
- With the level of density we want to achieve in the CVSP, we need to recognize that there might be some areas with LOS D or worse.
- Concerned about traffic congestion and traffic conditions below LOS D.
- Traffic congestion may be necessary in order to encourage transit use. Transit needs to be more desirable than driving.
- Does the customized approach allow for intersections to have higher or lower LOS standards? *It will allow for a customized approach, which is subject to the traffic impact analysis.*
- Will the new circulation policy for Coyote Valley include trails? *Trails are part of the CVSP circulation strategy, and pedestrian and trail circulation may also be discussed in the circulation policy for the CVSP. There are currently no LOS standards for trails.*
- How will we account for parking? Will we use a transportation demand management system or parking cash out? If we are using cash out, there are criteria that have to be built into this plan. *Whichever transportation policy is developed, it will include TDM and transportation system management (TSM) measures.*
- The 1975 General Plan indicted that Coyote Valley development would improve traffic conditions by contributing to a reverse commute.
- Recommended having a traffic policy that exempts Coyote Valley from the Citywide LOS standard with a customized approach. The primary goal is creating density. Need to encourage transit-oriented development and transit use. Need to create a jobs/housing balance, encourage transit, and take advantage of Caltrain. Need to think creatively.
- The goal is not to have LOS challenges like the rest of the City. The challenge is how to take advantage of the reverse commute and the jobs/housing balance. Coyote Valley is supposed to be a sustainable, pedestrian-oriented community. If we get this right, we may surprise ourselves. This is an opportunity to look at new ways of looking at transportation. Recommended looking at River Oaks as an example.
- When developing a transportation plan to internalize traffic, the jobs/housing balance is important.
- Would like information on cities with populations that are dependent on transit. Need to understand whether low LOS encourages people to use transit. Recommended creating a flexible traffic policy to encourage transit use.

- Some cities have already taken different approaches to the Valley Transportation Plan 2030 (VTP 2030). Instead of using VTA buses, Los Gatos uses its own shuttles.
- Are there recent examples of protected intersections and changes in LOS? What are the most appropriate approaches for which situation?
- How will the traffic analysis relate to approved projects like Cisco? 6.6 million square feet of transportation infrastructure has already been approved, which includes 2.2 million square feet for the Bailey Avenue interchange. *This will be factored into the traffic modeling, which will be discussed as a part of the next agenda item.*
- The phasing of transportation improvements should accommodate major corporate users. Transportation infrastructure should be in place to service workplace user potential. Need to accommodate jobs to make this plan work.
- The EIR should consider Coyote Valley traffic impacts to adjacent areas, particularly Almaden Valley. *The EIR will analyze Coyote Valley traffic impacts on the region, however the CVSP should not be expected to solve existing traffic problems. The EIR will identify mitigation measures, and the City Council will ultimately decide whether to go forward with the project and which mitigation measures will be required.*
- Glad that this considers Council's transportation policy so that the Parkway is taken into account.
- It is important to "think out of the box." At the beginning of each task force meeting, photos were shown of how other cities have reduced the use of cars by using alternative modes of transportation. Trails can be a means of reducing LOS if they are designed to accommodate golf carts, small electric cars, etc.

The public provided the following questions and comments:

- Brian Schmidt, with Committee for Green Foothills, indicated that taking advantage of the reverse commute emphasizes the point that the San Jose 2020 General Plan job triggers should be strengthened, not weakened. Putting housing before jobs will worsen the commute. Need to figure out the number jobs in Coyote Valley. About two years ago, staff estimated that 7 percent of the 50,000 jobs would be secondary jobs. Several months later, the CVSP transportation consultant indicated that 17 percent of the 50,000 jobs would be secondary jobs. Has this figure been resolved yet? Secondary jobs impact areas outside Coyote Valley. Will there be an estimate of the traffic impacts to these areas? How will this be determined?
- Melissa Hippard, with the Sierra Club, indicated that using the existing citywide LOS D standard for Coyote Valley would be inadequate. The traffic policy should be comprehensive and cutting edge to complement smart growth, transit-oriented development. The traffic policy should be proactive and offer specific guidelines for CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) mitigation. In order to get a comprehensive picture of the issue, the task force should ask staff to come back with policy options. When considering transportation issues, it is important to remember that Coyote Valley is a community in San Jose, not a stand-alone city. Caltrain is extremely important

to the CVSP. A community of 80,000 people will require a lot of services that are not currently planned.

- Bob Eltgroth, with the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, indicated that whenever bicycle facilities are brought up, trails are considered as bicycle facilities. However, staff indicated that trails are not part of the LOS. Roads should be considered as bicycle facilities. Recommended reviewing VTA's bikeway and pedestrian planning guidelines to see how it can be applied to the CVSP. The City of San Jose also has a bikeway master plan. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has held studies for pedestrian LOS. There is a problem if you allow cars to go through intersections, but not pedestrians to walk across. The LOS is important for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users.
- Martin Seebach, representing his family and himself, would like to know the details of the proposed Monterey Road widening. How wide is the existing Monterey Road? What is the proposed width? How many feet will be taken off of properties along the western and eastern side of Monterey Road? He also wanted to know what offsetting improvements were required for the Evergreen industrial park. Martin also asked how much it cost to use the Coyote Creek Golf Club for community meetings.

## **6. Review Traffic Modeling Methodology for Coyote Valley**

Hans Larsen, deputy director of the Department of Transportation, reviewed the traffic modeling methodology for Coyote Valley. Hans discussed the transportation forecasting steps, which include defining the land use and transportation plan, preparing a transportation simulation forecast, and analyzing the transportation system performance. He also explained the definition of traffic various Levels of Service (LOS).

The task force provided the following questions and comments:

- Has the traffic model been run yet? Can this information be available to Santa Clara County? It is important for the County's Road and Airports Department to look at the traffic data and determine what the traffic impacts will be to Highway 101, Monterey Road, Santa Teresa Boulevard, etc. When will the County be able to review the traffic analysis? *The model has been used for a variety of studies, but the traffic analysis for Coyote Valley has not been completed at this time. The information will be available in the draft EIR, which will be released in fall 2006. The South County Circulation Study is essentially running the same traffic model, and information from this effort will be available soon.*
- Can the traffic modeling do reiterative processes where the traffic run will indicate traffic conditions that may be beyond acceptable LOS? Will the land use densities be changed relative to the LOS projected by the traffic analysis outcomes? *The model is a tool for testing different scenarios to evaluate whether they are acceptable traffic conditions or not. Mitigation measures can be proposed to alleviate impacts.*
- Caltrain is currently a single track going through Coyote Valley. In order to provide a full service in Coyote Valley, double tracking in both directions is necessary. How will the

traffic analysis address this issue? How will the traffic modeling address the interface between the internal transit system and Caltrain? *The traffic model will look at horizon year 2030 for the Coyote Valley travel forecast. The model will assume that Caltrain improvements include double tracking and increased services from San Jose to Gilroy. The internal bus rapid transit system is proposed to be integrated with the Coyote Valley Caltrain station.*

- Encouraged the City to have conversations with Caltrain, particularly about the implications of Caltrain electrification. *The City and VTA are coordinating with Caltrain.*
- 2000 Measure A includes Caltrain improvements between San Jose and Gilroy. Caltrain will have double tracking down to Morgan Hill by 2010, followed by Gilroy. The double tracking to Morgan Hill will offer twenty trips per day.
- There may be a June 2006 tax ballot measure to acquire additional funding for VTA. As we consider VTA operations, we need to ensure that there are VTA resources for systems in Coyote Valley. Recommended providing as much information as possible to VTA so that they can look at project prioritization as it relates to funding. Is there an assumption that Coyote Valley will be built out? Would like a report back at the next task force meeting about how this conversation between the City and VTA went. Interested in Bu Rapid Transit (BRT) operations and how it is proposed to connect to Caltrain. *The CVSP is not factored into VTP 2030. There is an assumption that Coyote Valley will not be built out. The city has been working with VTA to put together their expenditure plan, which is being looked at to support a new transportation tax measure.*
- Does the MTC model take into account innovative transportation approaches used throughout the Bay Area (e.g NASA's TDM system and Stanford's requirement to maintain its peak LOS at 1989 levels)? *The MTC model can be calibrated to reflect various existing transportation factors and travel behavior in the area.*
- Recommended establishing a method of measuring how the Plan performs within the mode splits and whether we are achieving the Plan's goals. *This is a policy question as to how we want the Plan to perform. The traffic model provides information as to how the Plan performs and whether it is satisfactory or not, is a policy question.*
- Each mode split has a cost associated with it. This goes back to the question about parking costs. How will these elements be included in the process steps? *The model is sensitive to cost factors such as parking, driving, and transit.*

The public provided the following questions and comments:

- Richard DeSmet, a South Coyote Valley Greenbelt property owner and member of the Coyote Valley Alliance, asked if the EIR would analyze traffic impacts to South Coyote Valley. Santa Clara County will need a lot of money to repave roads south of Palm Avenue. *The EIR will analyze traffic impacts to the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt. Since the CVSP is not proposing any new urban development in the Greenbelt, the traffic analysis assumes that no new traffic will be generated from the Greenbelt.*

## **7. Public Comments**

The public provided the following comments:

- Brian Schmidt, with Committee for Green Foothills, indicated that there are two philosophies towards agricultural mitigation: (1) Need to keep in mind how much mitigation can be put on a project before it becomes too much, and (2) “Do it right or don’t do it.” He encouraged the task force to determine which approach they want to take. The “do it right or don’t do it” approach is primarily concerned with doing agricultural mitigation right, not making it economically feasible for developers and property owners. Brian indicated that the area southwest of Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Boulevard seemed like farmland, but was not designated as agricultural land on the map of potential agricultural land reviewed at the fourth Council progress report on January 31, 2006. He hopes that the agricultural land conversion issue comes back and is examined as to what is or is not designated as farmland in Coyote Valley.

## **8. Adjourn**

Councilmember Williams adjourned the meeting at 7:06 p.m. The next task force meeting will take place on February 27, 2006.